REMARKS

This is an amendment and remarks filed in response to the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2007 and accompanying a Request for Continued Examination. The Examiner had rejected claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,075 ("Mason") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,269,361 ("Davis"). Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,382 ("Sparks"). Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice. The rejections from the Office Action of October 3, 2007 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Mason in view of Davis. Mason relates to "obtaining Internet-type advertisements to fit designated advertising spaces allotted by a plurality of different and unrelated online newspaper websites, and automatically placing those advertisements." Mason, Abstract. Davis relates to influencing a position on a search result list. Davis, Abstract.

The combination of Mason and Davis fails to disclose an automated review of an advertisement where the advertisement is rejected when it is deemed not approved, and the advertisement is accepted when it is deemed approved as in independent claims 49, 67 and 92. The combination of Mason and Davis discloses a manual and not an automated review of advertisements. Mason, Col. 3, ll. 35-42. "[Advertisements] are displayed on a computer screen of at least one person responsible for the quality of those [advertisements]." *Id.* at Col. 3, ll. 38-40. In addition to requiring a person responsible for quality, the combination of Mason and Davis also discloses that the advertisements are "displayed on the computer screen of somebody such as the art director for final approval." *Id.* at Col. 5, ll. 55-57. Finally, the combination does disclose "methods for automatically tracking, auditing, comparing and changing online advertisements midstream, i.e., during the middle of an ad placement." *Id.* at Col. 4, ll. 54-57.

However, the combination of Mason and Davis fails to disclose or render obvious an automated review of an advertisement in an advertisement campaign as claimed.

The Examiner has stated that Davis teaches (and Mason fails to teach) providing an interface configured to allow for adjusting the maximum amount to spend during an advertisement campaign as claimed. 10/03/07 Office Action, p. 3-4. However, Davis discloses changing an advertisement bid for an auction method of purchasing advertisements. Davis, Col. 18, ll. 37-41. The bid is a price per display/click for one advertisement rather than a maximum amount to spend on an advertisement campaign. *Id.* at Col. 19, ll. 12-15. Accordingly, the combination of Mason and Davis fails to disclose or render obvious an interface configured to allow for adjusting the maximum amount to spend during an advertisement campaign as claimed.

For the reasons described above, Applicants submit that independent claims 49, 67 and 92, as amended, are allowable. Likewise, claims dependent from allowable claims 49, 67 and 92 are also allowable. Specifically, dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious over Mason in view of Davis. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 are allowable.

Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Sparks. Sparks relates to the design and production of print advertising and commercial display materials over the Internet. Sparks, Abstract. Sparks fails to disclose an advertisement campaign with an automated review as in independent claims 49 and 67. Therefore, dependent claims 53, 75 and 76 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice. The Official Notice relates to the display of advertisements on a wireless devices, the advertisement placement, advertisement costs per click, advertisement costs per impression, etc. There is no Official Notice of an advertisement campaign with an automated review as in independent claims 49, 67 and 92. Therefore, dependent claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

II. CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections from the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2007 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

October 30, 2007
Date

/Scott A. Timmerman/
Scott A. Timmerman
Registration No. 55,678
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200